

REPLY OF J. C. HUGHES, M. D.

Dean of the Medical Department of the Iowa State University,

TO A CERTAIN DOCUMENT PUBLISHED BY

JOHN F. SANFORD, 29615-

*Exposing his BASE FALSEHOODS and DARK DESIGNS against the
MEDICAL DEPARTMENT of the IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY.*

During the last winter it became my duty as Dean of the Medical Department of the Iowa State University, to report to the Superintendent of Public Instruction, and through him to the Legislature, the Scientific and Financial condition of said Institution.

I was compelled to place before that body, not only my own transactions as Dean, but also the condition in which I found the business of the former Dean, John F. Sanford; and in that report I endeavored to give facts in relation to his conduct, which have since been more fully substantiated by sworn testimony.

In presenting these to the Legislature, I aimed to couch the facts in as mild language as possible, and without any semblance of bitterness, as the report itself will show.

About two months since, a "yellow covered" document was heard of, purporting to be a reply of Dr. John F. Sanford to a report of the Keokuk Medical College, made to the Superintendent of Public Instruction, Nov. 1854. It did not have a general circulation at home, (which I very much regret,) but after diligent inquiry for some two weeks, I succeeded in securing a copy.

It opens, "To the Medical Profession and the Public," and on the first half page speaks of a report of the Dean of the Medical Department of the State University—of the writer's anxiety of mind and wretchedness of feeling, which the aspersions contained occasioned him; the consolation of friends, and above all, that his PRACTICE during his keenest persecution had QUADRUPLED, &c., &c.

It has now become my duty, in self-defence, to reply to this document. It is no longer a matter of the Medical Department of the State University, nor of the Faculty of that Department, but a question of public justice, and of veracity between John F. San-

ford and myself, and I wish the profession and the public to understand it in this sense.

I shall endeavor in my reply to be dignified and courteous, and shall show the reader, conclusively, before I close, that what was presented in my former report as Dean, was then, and is still true. That his attempt at justification of his conduct, and letters produced, do not alter in the least the truth of the charges set forth.

That he (Dr. Sanford) did report the cost of the MICROSCOPE purchased from Benj. Pike, Jr., New York, for the Medical College, at \$148, and presented a VOUCHER to that effect—when the instrument, as shown by Mr. Pike's own testimony, cost but \$48.

That he (Dr. Sanford) did report the PAYMENT of bill of Dr. C. E. Isaacs, of New York, at \$125, and presented a VOUCHER to that effect—while the articles received from Dr. Isaacs cost but \$25, as is shown by his testimony.

And the certificate of the Hon. John A. Graham, and the testimony of Prof. McGugin, proves conclusively, that he not only made these charges, but that he presented VOUCHERS for their payment.

In my report of November 30th, 1854, I spoke of the appropriation of \$5000 by the Legislature, and then copied a bill of expenditures, as presented by John F. Sanford to the former Superintendent of Public Instruction in 1852. I again copy from the same document, to which you can refer on page 10 of said Report, 1852:

"The General Assembly, at its session of 1850, appropriated to this department of the University, the sum of five thousand dollars, from the proceeds of the sales of the saline lands. This sum was made available, as will be seen by reference to the report of the former Dean, by receiving from the city of Keokuk her bonds, giving the State appropriation in pledge for their payment. This amount was set apart for special purposes, as will be seen by referring to pages 5 and 6 of the Superintendent's report of 1852. A part of the money having been received upon two of the bonds, from Messrs. Bangs & Bros. of New York, as may be seen by reference to the last report, (see page 9,) the application of this fund was entrusted by resolution of the Faculty to the then acting Dean, John F. Sanford, and was reported by him to have been expended as follows:

TABULAR EXHIBIT.

Amount paid by Messrs. Bangs & Bros.	\$1600 00
--------------------------------------	-----------

This amount Dr. Sanford received from Messrs. Bangs & Bros., for the Medical College, on Keokuk City bonds, issued for the benefit of said Institution.

Hear what Dr. Sanford says in the same report, in relation to this \$1600 dollars:

"The account of the expenditure of this money was kept by the Hon. Mayor of this city, with whom the principal part was deposited, and to whom VOUCHERS for the whole were exhibited and approved. The following is an exact copy of the account as rendered by him :"

What does the term "VOUCHERS" here mean, I would ask Dr. Sanford?

Here follows his bill:

Expenditures.

"Amount paid R. P. Gray, contractor on College building,	\$761 00
" Boatman for Lumber,	15 00
" J. A. Graham, cash advances,	81 25
" Shepard & Volentine,	60 00
" Cleghorn & Harrison,	50 61
" Edward Tarbell,	4 80
" Benjamin Pike, Jr., N. Y., Chemical Apparatus,	127 00
" Benj. Pike, Jr., N. Y., MICROSCOPE,	148 00
" Joseph Brano, Wax Specimens,	54 00
" C. E. ISAACS,	125 00
" J. L. Hatch. (Agent,) -	9 37
" George Friman,	100 00
" Bill of expenses incurred on trip from Keokuk to New York and return, as per bill of particulars, giving the items, &c.,	132 25
" Drayage, Porterage, &c.,	4 60
	<hr/>
	\$1672 89"

I now quote from my report to the Superintendent, that portion which refers to the discrepancy of John F. Sanford, and which seems so objectionable to him:

"Contrary to the provisions in the laws of the College, the Dean at the time selected as temporary Treasurer the Hon. Mayor of this City, with special reference to this fund. After the return of the Dean from New York City, where he had been to purchase appliances, the disbursement of the fund was reported to the said temporary Treasurer, to whom VOUCHERS were exhibited for the payment of the several sums as expended. The said Treasurer saw these vouchers, as is shown by the following certificate:"

Keep it in mind that the Hon. John A. Graham was temporary Treasurer, appointed by John F. Sanford *alone*, and this same John F. Sanford was the Dean here referred to. And now follows the certificate of the Hon. Mayor Graham:

(Copy of Certificate—see page 10 former report of John F. Sanford.)

"I hereby certify that John F. Sanford, Dean of the Medical Institution of the City of Keokuk, Iowa, produced to me full and satisfactory VOUCHERS for the payments made by him as Dean as aforesaid, to the amount stated, say \$1672 89, which will overpay the amount which was deposited in my hands as Treasurer, the sum stated \$72 89.

(Signed) JOHN A. GRAHAM."

I would ask John F. Sanford what "*satisfactory vouchers*" mean in this certificate of the Hon. John A. Graham? Was it not to present *proof* of the payment of these sums as set forth by him, in his report? And who *made* these vouchers? Did Benj. Pike or C. E. Isaacs place their names to them? If they did not I would ask *who* did? Now for the balance of the objectionable part of my report:

"The amount overpaid, \$72 89, is again charged to the College, being included in John F. Sanford's bill, as you may see by reference to 23d line on page 12 of former report.

"After this report was made, circumstances transpired which led some members of the Faculty to suspect a misapplication of the funds by the Dean, and investigations were made which resulted in the following disclosures:

"For the article of Microscope, purchased from Benjamin Pike, Jr., of New York, he reports to have paid \$148 00, and presented a voucher to this effect, whereas the duplicate of Mr. Pike's bill, on file in this office, shows that the cost of the instrument was but \$48 00. Here is a deficiency which has not been explained. Also, the bill of C. E. Isaacs he reports to have been \$125 00, when a letter on file in this office from Dr. Isaacs states that the amount paid was but \$25 00. Thus the Institution has lost \$200 which was appropriated by the State for its benefit, as shown by these exhibits, and as soon as he (the Dean) was informed by the Faculty that these documents were in their possession, he resigned his connection with the Institution, leaving the Chair of Surgery vacant."

I would now ask any citizen or member of the profession whether I have used even harsh language in my report?

Dr. S., in his water-colored reply, uses the term "*fraud*" at least three or four times. Such language cannot be found in my report, which was printed, and to which I refer you. Yet from his own troubled conscience or excited imagination, he has it pictured with almost convincing boldness.

The first item of my report which he objects to, is certainly a very happy one for a commencement on his part, as the Hon. John

A. Graham, whom he selected as temporary Treasurer, is, (to use his own language,) "a gentleman of undisputed responsibility and integrity." It was not the *man* that I objected to, but his *management* in the premises.

In the first place, the by-laws of the College give the Dean no such power.

Second—If, as he claims, he had authority to act for two absent members of the Faculty, he would still control but one-half of the votes of the Faculty, who, to quote his own language, exercise the legal powers of the College?

Third—If his procedure had been legal and regular, would it not, and should it not, appear upon the record books of the College, particularly as he kept them himself and could alter or amend at will?

I have only to say that it does not appear on record, nor did he ever consult a member of the Faculty here upon the subject.

I am cheerful to acknowledge that his appointment of the Hon. John A. Graham was a very fortunate one, if not for himself, certainly for me. His certificate, which I have copied, speaks for itself, to which I call your attention most respectfully. (See page 4.)

His second trouble to which he refers, as contained in my report, is the article of microscope. He says: "It is charged that I purchased from Benjamin Pike, Jr., of New York, a microscope, for which I reported to have paid \$148, and presented vouchers to that effect, when the duplicate of Mr. Pike's bill shows that the instrument was but \$48. This is a mistake in the sense which the report of J. C. Hughes intends to convey." Now hear John F. Sanford's excuse for this act: "I desired to purchase a microscope for Pathological investigation. I bought a low priced one in my own name, and mentioned to Mr. Pike that it was for myself, but that I would order the better instrument as soon as we could realize our funds. In my former report to the Superintendent of Public Instruction, to whom I was amenable, I reported the purchase of a \$150 instrument, *intending to order it as soon as possible, and retain the one I had bought in my own name, and charge myself with the amount!!!!* At that time, the truth was, I had increased expenses and responsibilities, closely connected with the best interests of the Institution, and not deemed advisable to be made a *matter of public account!* but which were understood and acquiesced in by my colleagues, with perhaps one exception."

Here he admits the fact and endeavors to offer in justification a most sickening excuse, such as a child would hardly dare offer to a parent for the most trivial misdemeanor. And yet, even in this, he forgets to say one word about the VOUCHERS that the Hon. John A. Graham certifies to, and his own statement on page 7, lines 23-24, proves. My opinion is—and I think it must be the opinion of

every man who is not so blind that he will not see—that if his statement was correct, that the Hon. John A. Graham certified to having seen a *voucher* which was to be *presented at some future time*, say at any convenient season that he might see fit to purchase a \$150 instrument for the Medical College. It is a great pity that these VOUCHERS could not be got rid of, as I think he could reason more clearly.

But there is more testimony than the Hon. John A. Graham's on this subject of VOUCHERS, and much more on the *cost of microscope, &c.*

I will now present testimony not in the shape of certificates or *complimentary letters* from persons who know nothing of the circumstances, but *sworn to* before the proper authority, where each party had the same chance of representation.

I will prove by the testimony of Benj. Pike, Jr., of New York, that the microscope purchased of him by John F. Sanford cost but \$48, instead of \$148, as represented in his report. (See report of testimony taken in the case of the College of Physicians and Surgeons, *vs.* John F. Sanford, instituted to recover for the benefit of the College, certain lots held by said Sanford. Paper A.)

I will prove by Prof. Sanborn, who was the partner of Dr. Sanford at the time these facts were first known to the Faculty, that he (Dr. Sanford) at two different times, told Prof. Sanborn that the microscope which he purchased from Mr. Pike, and which the College now have, *cost* \$148. I will also prove by the same individual, that after these facts became known to the Faculty, his partner, Prof. Sanborn, withdrew from partnership with him, and one of his reasons for so doing, was the dishonest course he (Dr. Sanford) had pursued with regard to this microscope matter, and his reply to Prof. Sanborn's statement or reasons, was to this effect: "*that he could not help it—there was no other way—fact was, I had said so before to other persons, and have to stick to it—it is the first time I ever did do such a thing,*" and then closed his conscience-writhing acknowledgment by a kind of personal apology to his partner, (Prof. Sanborn,) for having deceived him and personally betrayed his confidence. See Paper (B.)

As Prof. Sanborn may not be widely known throughout the State, allow me to introduce a letter spontaneously tendered him a few weeks since, when about to leave for the East, where he is at this time. See Paper (C.)

The sentiments of this letter are not equivocal, and the names attached to it, to use Sanford's own language in relation to most of them, "need no introduction to the public from me. Many of them are known throughout Iowa, some of them throughout the United States, and all of them are gentlemen of high and honora-

ble principles, who know what should be done, and exercise the sublime right of doing it."

I will prove by Prof. McGugin that Dr. Sanford did, while Dean of the Faculty, present to him as President of that body, a *voucher* for \$148, as the price paid for the microscope purchased of Benj. Pike, Jr., New York. See Paper (D.)

I will present my own testimony on the same subject, which has been taken in the case of the Medical College, *vs.* John F. Sanford, for lots held by him as before mentioned, of which I shall hereafter speak, and which sustains the other testimony. See Paper (E.) The certificate of John A. Graham, and John F. Sanford's own statement as seen on pages 3-4, in relation to that certificate, corroborates the testimony of Prof. McGugin as well as my own.

This testimony must satisfy every one that Dr. John F. Sanford did pay but \$48 for the microscope, instead of \$148 as represented. That it was purchased for the College and not for his own use. Read his own language as contained in his report, (p. 11,) which is itself sufficient, without even referring to the sworn testimony.— "The principal part of the sum specified above (meaning the \$1672 89) was paid on contract for building the new College edifice and to liquidate debts of the Institution, previously incurred. The remainder *was* expended in the purchase of *chemical apparatus, achromatic microscope, pathological preparations*, and other appliances for teaching."

Can this convey any other meaning than the words themselves imply, that all were alike purchased for the Medical College and out of the funds belonging to said Institution.

John F. Sanford well knows, and the bill and testimony of Mr. Pike show, that the instrument was purchased Nov. 13th, 1851.— Now, I would ask the question, how long after this purchase until his report was made to the Superintendent of Public Instruction? If he will consult documents he will find that his report was not presented until after the 24th of Nov. 1852, more than one year after the purchase. All this time he was mingling with the different members of the Faculty from day to day, and for a portion of the time in partnership with one of them, yet *not a word*, nor even an intimation on the subject passed his lips to the Faculty, nor did they know any thing of it for some time after.

If it is this that he refers to when he says "but which were understood and acquiesced in by my colleagues with, perhaps, one exception," I would refer the reader to the testimony of his colleagues, *Profs. McGugin, Sanborn, Hudson* and myself.

His third trouble is the bill of C. E. Isaacs, as found in my report. I will again quote his language on that point. "Also, he reports the bill of C. E. Isaacs to have been \$125, when a letter on

file in this office, from Dr. Isaacs, states that the amount paid was but \$25."

I will here quote that part of Dr. Isaacs' letter from which I made this statement :

NEW YORK, Jan. 28th, 1853.

"DEAR SIR :—Yours of the 14th of Jan. is just received. An arrangement was made between Dr. Sanford and myself, that I should send some specimens for your University, and he handed me \$25 for that purpose, for which I gave him a receipt," &c.

I would ask every honest man whether I said as much as the language of this letter justifies. I did not even state that Dr. Sanford had received a *voucher* from Dr. Isaacs for the amount, which the language of the letter proves.

Not only does Dr. Isaacs' letter justify my report in the case, but his oath confirms the truth of it. See Paper (F.)

But when Sanford finds himself so closely cornered, he comes out and acknowledges the *fact*, and then proceeds with special pleading in justification, by saying no one denies that the amount paid at the time was but \$25, and says the facts are as follows :—

"Whilst in New York, I applied to Dr. Charles E. Isaacs, who was then Demonstrator of Anatomy in the College of Physicians and Surgeons of New York, to purchase some pathological specimens for the school here. He informed me that he had but few at that time, but if I wished it, would put them up and procure more. I then made a contract with him to procure a set of diseased bones for the Institution, which he informed me would cost about \$100, but he said he did not wish to collect and prepare them unless it was certain we would take them. I made a definite contract with him, paying the \$25 for what I then obtained, and pledging him to retain \$100 in my hands to transmit to him, whenever he notified me that the preparations were ready. It was not until some months after that I received a letter from him, stating that it was very difficult to procure those specimens in New York, but that he would soon sail for Paris and would procure them for me there if I would *send him the money*. This letter I did not receive until three days after the time appointed for the sailing of the vessel, and consequently could not write him. *Of course I reported the contract of \$125 with Dr. Isaacs, since I had a special contract with him for that amount.*"!!!

Let us take a peep through the scum of this fabrication. He says: "I made a definite contract with him, paying the \$25 for what I then obtained." This contract was made when? November, 1851, and the money receipted for, so says Dr. Isaacs' letter. Did he obtain a single specimen from Dr. Isaacs at that time? No. If *he* did the College never received them. Again, when were these pathological specimens, for which the money was paid,

forwarded to him—the then acting Dean of the Faculty, for the College? April 8th, 1852, just before he (Dr. Isaacs) sailed for France. The balance of the same contract was not furnished until after his return from Europe. You will see from these facts that some five months had elapsed after the contract mentioned with Dr. Isaacs before the first specimens were started from New York. He (John F. Sanford,) pledged himself to retain in his hands \$100, to transmit whenever he (Isaacs) should notify him that the specimens were ready. I would ask Dr. Sanford what he was doing with this \$100 belonging to the College, all this time; and when did he expect to be notified that the specimens were ready? It was very uncertain when these specimens would be ready, and it was necessary that Dr. Sanford should hold the \$100, as it might not be as *safe* if it were in any *other* hands. Read again what he says: “That it was very difficult to procure these specimens in New York, but that he (Dr. Isaacs) would soon sail for Paris, and would procure them for me there, if I would send him the money.” This letter he says he did not receive until three days after the sailing of the vessel, and consequently could not write to him. Dr. Isaacs sailed for France, when? The 10th of April, 1852, about five months after the purchase and payment of the \$25. Was Dr. Isaacs’ own language not enough to satisfy Dr. Sanford, or any other man, that his specimens would not be purchased unless the money was forwarded? If he were still so tenacious for the contract, or for the \$100, was there not time to decide the matter in his own mind before he made his report, which was nearly eight months after Dr. Isaacs had made his statement to him, when five months of that time Dr. Isaacs was in New York, having returned from France in June.

He closes his excuse by stating, “Of course I reported the contract of \$125 with Dr. Isaacs, since I had a special contract with him for that amount.” *Of course* he did not report any such a thing, but *he, John F. Sanford, did report amount paid C. E. Isaacs \$125.* See copy of bill from his own report, page 3. There is a wide difference between these statements, and carries the *lie* too plainly upon its face to make our citizens or the profession of the West endorse it.

He does not only say that the amount paid was \$125 instead of \$25, the actual amount, but that he exhibited a *voucher* for the same. See certificate of the Hon. John A. Graham—page 3; also testimony of Prof. McGugin, then President of the Faculty. And this is not all for which he says *vouchers* were presented.—The 148 dollar microscope instead of \$48, the actual cost, is also included, as well as the entire balance of the \$1672 89, for a part of which I may have to make some inquiries of him before I close.

Again he says: "This report of J. C. Hughes then adds: Thus the institution has lost \$200." I will finish the sentence for him: "which was appropriated by the State for its benefit as shown by these exhibits."

If the reader will take his bill. (See page 3.)

Amount paid Benj. Pike Jr. New York, Microscope, -	\$148 00
Amount paid C. E. Isaacs, - - - -	125 00

His representation of these two items amount to -	\$273 00
---------------------------------------------------	----------

Now take the actual cost of Microscope. (See Mr.

Pike's testimony,) - - - - -	\$48 00
Actual amount paid Dr. C. E. Isaacs. (See Dr. Isaacs' testimony,) - - - - -	25 00

This gives the actual cost, - - - -	\$73 00
-------------------------------------	---------

Now take the actual cost from the represented cost of John F. Sanford and there is a difference of \$200, and certainly I did not misrepresent the institution when I said that it had lost \$200, which was appropriated by the State for its benefit, as shown by these exhibits. The institution has certainly never received the benefit of this \$200, and I would ask any one, and every one, interested in the welfare of our State institution, looking at the testimony here presented, *WHO HAS? and where is this \$200 now? Has the institution or John F. Sanford got it?* I answer, and every one must be convinced, the institution has not.

He claims that the institution owed him \$297 00, and that if he even had applied it to his own use, which in justice to himself he might, the college could not have lost any thing by the transaction.

If John F. Sanford's claim against the College of \$297 00, which he held at the time this \$200 was retained by him, and which he continued to hold without the knowledge of the Faculty at the time he made his report to the Superintendent in the winter of 1852, and which was in that report presented by him as a debt due him from the College, was a just one, (a part of which at least I have always doubted,) why did he not, having this \$200 of the College money, charge himself with it in that report, as it was not made for more than a year after the transaction in which he retained, without authority, the above sum. Had this been done, he would have given his friends, who have, and are still determined to sustain him, right or wrong, a better opportunity for argument in justification of his course, and even then it would have required backing up by certificates. It was unfortunate for the Dr. that his report had been made to the Superintendent, and published by him, before he learned that the Faculty had discovered

any thing in relation to his transactions in New York. Had he known that the actual cost of the Microscope, or the amount paid Dr. Isaacs, would have ever been discovered by the Faculty, he might have fixed it up in a better shape—and yet the VOUCHERS which he presented to the Hon. John A. Graham as well as to Prof. McGugin, the President of the Faculty, one of them for \$148 for Microscope, which I saw myself, leave it in a condition which he finds it impossible to get over, and which cannot, with all the certificates which he has, or may present, be made to appear in any other light than what it really is.

Again he says: “If I had wished to take the funds of the College, for my own use, I could have done so during the summer of 1852. Mr. Bangs failing in his contract the bonds were sold to the firm of Cox & Shelley, and they agreed to pay certain debts of the institution. Amongst these was my claim of nearly \$300. Some time in June of that summer two persons belonging to the Faculty, one of them this J. C. Hughes, (I rejoice that it is not J. F. Sanford,) affecting to know some cause why my claim should not be paid, went to Mr. Shelley and ordered him not to pay it.”

Two members of the Faculty never called upon Mr. Shelley, as he states, but this J. C. Hughes of whom he speaks, did call upon Mr. S., having been authorized by the Faculty to do so. The reason why it became necessary for us to pursue this course was, that after the purchase of the city bonds by the firm of Cox & Shelley, this John F. Sanford, who was the then acting Dean, took it upon himself to draw upon Messrs. Cox & Shelley for the payment of claims due from the College, without having them presented or even consulting the Faculty with regard to them; the result was that some old claims due our citizens who had given us their money and influence in the commencement of the enterprise were allowed to go unpaid, while others of less urgency, and some of which little was known by the Faculty, were cancelled. I was therefore directed to call upon these gentlemen, and inquire into the condition of our finances, and request the firm not to pay out any more of the funds belonging to the institution, or give acceptances unless by the order of the Faculty, and that order signed by the President and Dean. After performing the duties which had been assigned me, Mr. Shelley remarked that upon the purchase of the bonds he had made a sort of promise to Dr. Sanford that *his* claim should be paid, and he, or one of the firm remarked in connection, that they had sold the Dr. a buggy, and unless they credited him on his College claim it would be a long time before they would get their pay. John F. Sanford says that the firm of Cox & Shelley agreed to pay his claim of nearly \$300. *Who did they make this agreement with?* John F. Sanford of course. *Who autho-*

did this agreement? Not the Faculty, but this same John F. Sanford, who was then Dean, and who sold the bonds to these gentlemen. Here is a plain admission that he intended to collect from the College funds, the amount claimed by him, without the knowledge or consent of the Faculty, and this too nearly one year after he had pocketed the \$200 of the College money by his misrepresentation of the purchase from Benj. Pike, Jr., of the Microscope, and the purchase of Pathological specimens from Dr. Isaacs, without allowing a single member of the Faculty to know that he had in his possession one dollar of the College money—but on the contrary presented his report to Thos. H. Benton, Jr. Superintendent of Public Instruction, and in that report (to which I refer you for the truth of what I here state,) presented *bills* and *vouchers* from Benj. Pike, Jr., and Dr. C. E. Isaacs, which I have proved to be spurious.

This John F. Sanford again says: "That Mr. Shelley sent for him immediately, not recognizing my authority, and offered to pay him at once." This may be true. For if he were owing the firm either for buggy or merchandise, it was their policy to get the matter arranged as soon as possible, while there were yet means in their hands due the institution, and while John F. Sanford was yet the Dean, and had by virtue of his office some authority.

Hear him again: "After this occurrence, and after these gentlemen were aware of the fraud of which they now complain, I remained associated with them during the entire summer, and during lecture time in winter, without receiving any marks of disapprobation. Nothing was said to me upon the subject, and I gave my full course of lectures, as usual."

When John F. Sanford was penning these words, he knew, and his conscience told him, he was stating a falsehood.

In answer to his statement, let me ask him who composed the Faculty at that time?

Professors HUDSON, MCGUGEN, SANBORN, SANFORD, & HUGHES, the Chair of Physiology and Pathology having been added on to the other Chairs during the Session of 1852-3.

The testimony of the entire Faculty positively contradicts his statement.

Prof. Sanborn testifies, as you can see by reference to his evidence, (Paper B.) that nothing was known by the Faculty, until after *his* partnership with Dr. Sanford—in the winter of 1852.

"I admit," as Prof. Sanborn states, "that I had suspected, with some other members of the Faculty, for some time, that there was something rotten in Denmark, but had never mentioned even my suspicion, until during the session of 1852-3, and then only to some two or three members of the Faculty, and never outside of

the Faculty until after the letters had been received from Mr. Pike and Dr. Isaac, confirming our suspicion."

Hear what Prof. Hudson says in reply to a letter—written him a few weeks since, in which I quoted the language of Dr. Sanford before referred to.

"STERLING, April 20th, 1855.

Respecting the language you quote as being contained in Sanford's reply to your report, it may now be merely sufficient for me to say, with yourself, that if that is his statement, it is not the fact—nor is there anything but opposite affinity between it and the truth of the matter, excepting that he gave his mal-enthusiastic course of lectures. During that session there was no profound disagreement between his willfully jealous, disrespectful policy, and his clever, retaliating detractions; his impertinent cupidity, and his intensely fine double dealing."

Again, hear what Prof. Hudson says in answer to the following questions:

QUESTION—"When did you first suspect Dr. Sanford of having misrepresented to the Faculty the price paid Benj. Pike, Jr., of New York, for a Microscope purchased for the Medical College?"

ANS.—"When he first mentioned the cost of the Instrument."

QUES.—"What led you to suspect him?"

ANS.—"His outside badge of honesty, which repeatedly over-leaped itself, and fell on the other side."

See what Prof. McGugin testifies to, (Paper D.). He states that the first positive knowledge the Faculty had of the matter, was from a letter received from Mr. Pike, dated Dec. 21st, 1852, in answer to one which he had written him, Dec. 4th, of the same month.

Is not the testimony here offered, sufficient to convince every one that his statement is false, and that he knew it to be so before his morbid imagination even conceived the words which were to compose the sentence?

His document further states: "I then resigned my place in the Board of Instruction, and in a few days left for the South. I heard nothing more of this until about two months after, when I received letters in New Orleans, informing me that my enemies were busily engaged here in attempting to ruin me." Yes, he did resign, after being politely requested to do so; but he did not in that resignation, use the language, or convey the meaning that he now wishes to convey by stating that he resigned his place in the Board of Instruction.

It has been stated by some of his admirers, that he never resigned, and that he had merely refused to have any farther connection with the Institution for the time being; and that as one

of the original incorporators, the Faculty had no control in the matter; and that when it might please him or his friends, he would again take his position in the School.

I will here copy his resignation, so that all may know what his asserted claims upon the Institution amount to.

“KEOKUK, Jan. 29th, 1853.

Gentlemen of the Faculty of the College of Physicians and Surgeons of the Iowa University:

I herewith resign my Professorship of the Chair of Surgery in your Institution. This resignation you will please accept.

Very respectfully,

Yours, JNO. F. SANFORD.”

He left for the South, the last days of February, or 1st of March, 1853. It is rather unfortunate for his statement that I left about the same time, the 9th of March, for the East, and did not return for some four months, a month or more after his return. I, consequently, could not have been the enemy that was ruining him. John F. Sanford and his friends well know that I never have, as he states, “been industriously circulating in this community, and abroad, these charges in an aggravated form.” Although proven to be true, yet I have always avoided saying anything upon the subject, unless in answer to direct inquiries—and then I have always felt it my duty, and a privilege due me, to speak freely in relation to facts, whether it implicated John F. Sanford or any other man.

In my testimony—which was taken in the case of the Medical College *vs.* John F. Sanford, and to which I refer you—I was called upon to answer certain questions, and I then made a statement which I do not now remember of mentioning to anyone outside of the Faculty, and yet it is not less true than any other charge made. It is that part referring to his acknowledgment and confession to me of his guilt; stating that it was the first black spot in the history of his life, and asking me “for God’s sake not to say anything about it.” I should not even now have made this fact public, had I not been required to do so under oath.

I have now closed what I have to say for the present in reply to his little document, which I am sorry so few of our citizens have read, as its publication seemed intended but for a choice few. I have quoted as fully from it as space would permit, so that those who may read this reply may see his feeble and sophistical effort at getting over the matter, in justification of his conduct. But before I close, I have a few words to say with reference to his connection with the Medical Department of the Iowa University—what great services he has rendered the Institution—what sacrifices he has made for it—his kindly feeling for it since his resignation, &c.

John F. Sanford and his friends have led many of our citizens to believe that he was the creator—the preserver and bountiful benefactor, of the Medical Department of the Iowa University, and without him it could not live, move, or have a being. Much credit is no doubt due him for his efforts, but he should not forget his associates, one of whom, at least, labored equally hard with himself, in its behalf, and being a citizen of the place, exerted quite as much influence in its favor. Had its existence depended upon the Faculty alone, Keokuk would still have been without a Medical College. But that liberality which characterizes our citizens when a worthy object presents itself, was manifested then, and they immediately came forward and rendered the necessary aid, the Hon. H. T. Reid donating the lots, while others equally interested, furnished the means to erect thereon suitable buildings. The Hon. Mayor and City Council soon after, seeing the importance of the enterprise, appropriated sufficient for the erection of a commodious Hospital building in connection. This was the interest manifested by our citizens in the Institution then—the same feeling exists now even to a greater extent; and this enthusiasm with regard to the prosperity of our State Institution is not confined to the citizens of our own city, but is felt and exhibited by the citizens and the profession throughout the length and breadth of our young and flourishing State, in spite of every effort which has been made against it by John F. Sanford, its would be *creator*, assisted by those to whom he has, no doubt, offered Professorships, provided he should succeed in his base designs. I doubt much whether John F. Sanford's friends have ever looked at the condition of the School during his connexion with it, and its prosperity since his resignation. The Institution has already completed its fifth session, during three of which, he was one of its Professors and Dean of the Faculty.

The first session numbered 17 matriculants; the second session 19; and the third session, being the date of his resignation, but 15 students were present. How has it been during the last two sessions, with all his influence against it, carrying his bitter vindictiveness so far, and stooping even so low as to go to students who had already arrived in the city, or on their way hither for the purpose of attending Lectures, and trying to induce them to go to other Schools; presenting pitiful insinuations derogatory to the character of the School, and those connected with it? Yet at our next session, in defiance of all his efforts, our class numbered 41 students; and at the last session, the number had increased to 70. How do his friends account for this unparalleled prosperity, when it is a notorious fact that the number of Medical Students throughout the country, for the last three years, has been on the

decrease, and the classes of nearly all the Medical Schools have been lessened almost one-half? Still not satisfied, he made a move to organize an opposition School in the summer of 1853.— He had sworn to break down the School, and it must be donè; but finding he could not get those whose services and money he wished, to join him, he was compelled to issue his prospectus for a Medical Institute, with three Professors, viz: Professors John F. Sanford, Wyman and Farner. Those solicited to engage in the enterprise but who did not accept, were: Drs. Haines, Knowles, Bowen and Collins. But one student having made his appearance, it was thought best to abandon the enterprise, as it would not pay.

If John F. Sanford denies the statements which I have here made, I am ready to produce the proof.

Let us look at his next move. During the summer of 1854, after the partnership between he and Dr. Wyman was dissolved, he associated with him Dr. Rankin, who was better known as a successful politician than physician, and who was then, and continued for a time to be sub-editor and general traveling agent for the *Dispatch*. This move was to be a political one, he being a whig, and Dr. R. a democrat. The wires were to be managed with shrewdness, and without any appearance of malice; but on the contrary, great interest was to be manifested for the prosperity of the State Institution. He had concluded that it was impossible for him and the combined influence of his friends to crush the Institution, and they thought best to change their mode of attack.

To be, as they supposed, entirely successful in this effort, they must have the undivided influence of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, who is, *ex officio*, President of the Board of Trustees of the University. This they succeeded in securing by the nomination and election of the present incumbent, Dr. James D. Eads, who is known by the citizens and profession throughout the entire State, to be, since his nomination, not only an enemy of the Institution, but a friend and advocate of the interests of John F. Sanford. It is well known by this community, that *James D. Eads* did not get the vote of his own county for nomination—and I use Dr. Rankin's own statement, when I say, that had it not been for the influence exerted by him in his behalf, while traveling over the State, he could not have received the nomination; and that he was already pledged, if elected, to carry out their wishes in relation to the re-instatement of Dr. Sanford, and reorganization of the Institution. Let us see whether the course pursued by him after his election, with that pursued by John F. Sanford, does not corroborate the statements here made.

Scarcely had the Superintendant taken his oath of office, and seated himself in his new position, until a petition was secretly cir-

culating in this city, asking the reinstatement of John F. Sanford to the Chair of Surgery, in the Medical Department of the Iowa University. This was virtually asking for my removal, as I occupied the position at the time. After much effort on the part of himself and friends, they succeeded in securing 28 names.—Some of my friends discovering their scheme, immediately drew up a remonstrance which was signed by over two hundred of our citizens; among the number were the names of nearly one half of those who had been induced by misrepresentation to sign his petition, having learned that I was occupying the Chair, instead of that of Anatomy, which I had formerly occupied.

I immediately visited Iowa City, and placed before the Superintendent and Trustees the remonstrance, and other facts relative to the legality of the matter, denying to the Superintendent any authority for such procedure. He very wisely consulted the Attorney General, who put a quietus upon the whole transaction by deciding the appointing power to be vested in the Faculty. This being settled, what was his next move? To place himself, as is usual, in the hands of his friends, and it was soon decided that the appointing power, vested in the Faculty should be taken from them by act of the Legislature, and given to the Trustees, of whom five are appointed bi-ennially by that body.

This seemed to be a plausible scheme, if cautiously managed.—I will relate a single instance of his manœuvering.—It shows the *man* and what he will resort to to accomplish his *base designs*. Dr. ELBERT, of Van Buren county, was the Democratic candidate for State Senator, and it is well known that this gentleman belongs to Sanford, or *vice versa*, that Sanford is owned by him. It was a matter of great import for the success of Sanford's measure, that this gentleman should be elected. As the election approached, the prospect seemed to darken, but in a moment of despair a bright spot gleamed in the horizon. Sanford thought of his brother-in-law, who was a whig and a resident of that county, and at once determined that he should be sacrificed to secure the election of Dr. Elbert. In the dead hour of the night, from an office in this city, emanated hand-bills, which were at dawn of day circulating throughout Van Buren county, announcing the name of *Dr. Craig* as a candidate for the State Senate. And here was Sanford, in this city, claiming to be a whig, and voted the ticket (perhaps) with the alteration of a single name, while in the adjoining county he was using every effort to defeat the whig candidate (*but did not succeed*) by sacrificing his own brother-in-law, who received but 31 votes.

Failing to secure his MEN, he visited Iowa City during the session and had a bill introduced, in which were the names of *some of*

his defeated candidates, as Trustees of the University. It did not pass but one House until the scheme was discovered by the friends of our State Institution, when its fate was at once sealed. I reached the city just in time for its defeat, and could its *creator* been there to have witnessed the last moments of his nursed offspring, he would have been melted to tears, and no doubt heard to exclaim—*Persecution—Persecution.*

And has his vindictiveness to the State Institution stopped here? No. Hardly had the winter closed when he, and his defeated friends were moving in another scheme equally base in its designs, and in which they tried to “steal the livery of Heaven, in which to serve the Devil.” It was the establishment of a Medical School in this city in opposition to the State Institution, and under the auspices of the Iowa Wesleyan University, hoping to secure the Church and its Ministry in favor of, and in opposition to the present State organization. The Trustees of that University, as well as the Church generally, being familiar with the character of the man (I mean John F. Sanford,) who conceived it, and the motives which induced its conception, were led at once, not only to look upon it as premature, but, while it would be controlled by one who has preached infidelity at one time, and catholicism at another, and was willing to be wafted by every breeze which might hoist the highest sail for himself, and in opposition to a flourishing State Institution, to consider its admission as a branch of their University a foul stab at the basis of the enterprise, and like a mill-stone about its neck, would drag out the very vitals of the parent department of that young, but (yet to be) prosperous school. Upon what basis he and his friends expect to breathe into this opposition of the Medical Department of the State University its future existence, is a mystery to this community, and remains to be answered in the future.

I have now closed what I have to say in relation to the course pursued by Sanford and some of his friends toward our State Institution. I have yet to consider their *secret*, *base* and cowardly attacks upon the Faculty, but more especially their *foul* and *scandalous* falsehoods, which they have been secretly circulating by printed circulars, throughout this and the adjoining States, derogatory to the character of each of its members, but intended more particularly, to crush my reputation, by giving me a stab in the dark, from which they hoped I might not recover.

In bringing before the public the circular to which I refer, I am under the necessity of implicating to some extent, one of the benevolent institutions of our city. I refer to Hardin Lodge, No. 29, of the order of Free and Accepted Masons. I am sorry that the members of this order, or of any other benevolent enterprise, should have to suffer for the acts of a few.

A *Card* appears in the reply of John F. Sanford, with the names of H. W. Sample and J. M. Shelley attached, in which is contained statements entirely void of truth; and it astonishes me to see these gentlemen carry their prejudice so far that they would warp the truth to favor their friend, when the falsity of their statements can be proven by the books themselves, as well as by gentlemen who were present.

Although the card does not touch the point in question, which I am sorry they overlooked, (I mean the \$200 and VOUCHERS,) yet these gentlemen, in the same vein of prejudice, practised an imposition on the brethren of the fraternity, by reporting a resolution to Hardin Lodge, which is not only *false*, but *base* and *slandrous*; and which led to the publication of a circular, in which I am charged (though not named) with every form of dishonesty, and John F. Sanford cleansed from all impurity, and his character rendered less spotless than the authors of the card themselves.

How desperate must be Sanford's cause, when such startling and glaring misrepresentations are required to cover up his iniquities—how shockingly depraved is that heart, which can resort to such open, such naked untruths to sustain him in his miserable breaches of honor and honesty. How can John F. Sanford, without a cold shudder in his heart, look at this circular calmly and deliberately, and allow it to be sent forth, as it has been done by him, to *all* the Lodges throughout this and the adjoining States, where I must be charged with slander, in open Lodge, without an opportunity to defend myself, when he knows—yes, even sees and feels its falsehood engraven upon every step in his downward career.

COPY OF CIRCULAR.

"MASONIC HALL, HARDIN LODGE, No. 29, }
KEOKUK, IOWA, May 16th, 1853, S. L. 5853. §

Among other things, the following proceedings were had.

WHEREAS, Gross and malicious charges and slanders have been propagated and circulated in the community, against the standing and character of one of our most estimable and honorable members, and WORSHIPFUL MASTER, Dr. John F. Sanford, by ENVOUS AND JEALOUS ENEMIES, during his temporary absence from his home and family; and Whereas, Brother Sanford has submitted a written statement of the facts, and his explanation and refutation of said charges, accompanied with the request that this Lodge should investigate the same individually and collectively, which having been fully and thoroughly done by the Lodge and many of the members thereof; thereupon, brothers SHELLEY, FARNER, and SAMPLE were appointed a committee with instructions to report a resolution expressive of the sense and conclusion of the Lodge, in the case of brother Sanford and his slanderers; which committee promptly reported the following resolutions.

RESOLVED, That the members INDIVIDUALLY and COLLECTIVELY (of Hardin Lodge, No. 29, entertaining the utmost confidence in the honesty and integrity as a citizen and mason, of brother John F. Sanford, against whom serious and malicious charges have been recently made, which are entirely false and unfounded; therefore, we advise the Masonic Fraternity to protect and sustain the reputation and standing of brother Sanford against the influence and malice of his slanderers.

ORDERED, That a copy of the foregoing preamble and resolution be forwarded by the Secretary to the various Lodges in this and adjoining States.

I hereby certify the foregoing Preamble and Resolution to be a correct copy from the original record.

H. W. SAMPLE.

Secretary Hardin Lodge, No. 29.

This had been in circulation nearly one year before I could secure a copy, and several months before I even heard of it.

Although Hardin Lodge becomes implicated by the action of a few of its members* in this unpleasant matter, yet a majority of them took no part in the transaction, and even those few who were present and participated, (save the *trio* I have mentioned,) are entirely free from censure, as they were acting upon the report of a committee from their own body, who are, no doubt, sworn to do justice to all parties concerned, whether members of the order or otherwise. I have yet too much confidence in the Masonic Order, to suppose that they would do me, or any other citizen injustice, when the facts here presented against one of its members are brought truthfully before them, but on the contrary, would discard him as unworthy the confidence and respect of its members, and should be shunned by every good citizen of the State.

A single instance or two of Sanford's dishonesty while Dean of the Faculty, remains to be noticed at this time. He was authorized to procure either by donation or purchase, certain lots situated in the College Block. The purchase was made at a mere nominal price, \$50 per lot, and would have been donated by the Hon. D. W. Kilbourne to the Institution, had not other parties for whom he was acting as agent, owned an interest with him. John F. Sanford, instead of having these lots deeded to the College, or to himself as Dean, in trust for the College—had the deed made to himself, individually, without reference to the Faculty or Institution, who have them to pay for. Suit is now pending against him for their recovery.

Here is another act of his financiering into his own pocket :

R. P. Gray, on oath, says that he was employed to plaster the Medical College (Old Edifice) at Keokuk, for the sum of \$80 00. I did so—Prof. John F. Sanford called on me for my bill, and told me to make it \$100 00. He paid me out of the College fund \$80 00, and took a receipt for \$100 00. He said the College owed him, and he took that method to get his money.

He said he would like to fix up other charges around the College in the same way.

R. P. Gray.

{
SEAL
}

Sworn to, and subscribed before me, June 11th, 1855, at Keokuk.
Witness my hand and Notarial Seal as N. P. of Lee Co., Iowa.

LLOYD D. SIMPSON,

Notary Public.

I must close what I have to say of Sanford for the present, although his dishonesty has not been confined to the simple facts which I have in these few pages seen fit to mention. Were I to trace him, which I might do, and which I may hereafter, from his sojourn in Waverly, Ohio, up to the present, I could write a volume which would neither interest him nor his friends. I might

Hardin Lodge numbered at this date, some 15 members.

yet refer to numerous instances connected with his College transactions of the same character, but of less magnitude, yet equally *base* and as susceptible of proof.

Every one must be fully satisfied, after reading this reply, and the testimony here appended, that I have fully proven all that I stated in my report to which he objected, viz: The article of MICROSCOPE and Bill of Dr. C. E. Isaacs, &c., and in addition to what I then stated, I have presented other facts which darken the picture and make him to be more guilty and culpable than I could desire any member of so honorable a profession.

Although he has published me to citizens and strangers, as a QUACK and SCOUNDREL, placing me on the same level with himself—but without the numerous certificates of good standing—and with oaths upon his lips has threatened my life—giving to the persuasion of his friends the credit of preventing him from committing this foul deed. I am certainly indebted to those of his friends who have given such good advice; but those who have joined with him in his villainy in trying to crush me, I have only to say, that they have mistaken their man, and they may continue to cry persecution, persecution, in chorus with John F. Sanford, until the proceeds of his quadrupled practice, shall quadruple his friends, who shall be as lasting as the black spots which now stain his escutcheon, before they will be able by their combined influence to blast my reputation, or crush the State Institution with which I am connected. See Paper (G.)

EXTRACTS OF TESTIMONY.

PAPER (A).

BENJAMIN PIKE, Jr., of the City of New York, being of lawful age, deposes as follows.

INTERROGATORY—State whether you sold a bill of Instruments, Medical Apparatus, &c., to John F. Sanford near the 13th day of November, 1851; if so, please attach as an exhibit, a copy of said bill? State whether an Achromatic Microscope with adjusting screws was included, if so, what was the price of it? What price did John F. Sanford pay you for it? and what was the amount of the whole bill? Did you receipt him for it, and what was the amount of the receipt?

ANSWER—I did. The annexed paper, marked Exhibit (A.) is a bill of the items of Instruments, Apparatus, &c., so sold by me to John F. Sanford. An Achromatic Microscope, with adjusting screws, was included. The price of it was Forty-Eight dollars, and he paid me that price for it.

(Signed) BENJ. PIKE, Jr.

MONTGOMERY GIBBS, Commissioner.

EXHIBIT (A).

NEW YORK, Nov. 13th, 1851.

Mr. J. F. SANFORD, M. D.

Bought of BENJ. PIKE, Jr.,	
One Achromatic Microscope, with gage having adjusting screws,	\$48 00
Chemical Apparatus,	127 00
Total,	\$175 00

AFFIDAVIT OF PROF. J. E. SANBORN.

PAPER (B).

I arrived here in the last days of October, 1852, and during some weeks after my arrival, although Dr. Sanford and myself were friends, and interchanged practice, yet nothing of course was said by me, and little by him, even, respecting a formal partnership between us. It was mutually understood between us, that a partnership existed, or was to exist, but as he seemed to postpone the formalities, I, of course, could not and would not urge it.

During these few weeks, I gathered from my general intercourse with the Faculty of the Medical College, the conviction that strong suspicions were entertained by them respecting the correctness of Dr. Sanford's administration of the College business.—One of the prominent points of suspicion, and perhaps then, the only one, was respecting the cost of a Microscope, purchased by him, a year previously, for the College. It was thought the price paid was too high; it was suspected that it had by some means been overcharged. What led to this suspicion—how it originated, I know not—I only know that it existed at the time I speak of.

Under these circumstances, I hesitated very naturally to confirm my association by articles of agreement with Dr. Sanford, till I could banish all doubts respecting his integrity. Accordingly, desirous of some information upon which I could rely, and confused by the wandering doubts and suspicions, and situated as I was among strangers, I consulted my friend and patron, T. W. Clagett, for information respecting Dr. Sanford's character and integrity, naming too to him my fears about the microscope. Mr. Clagett's statements were so unequivocally confident in regard to Dr. Sanford's integrity, that my fears were largely dissipated. Anxious still further to convince myself, before I took any decided step, I resolved to obtain information directly from Dr. Sanford himself, respecting the cost of the microscope, and that too without informing him of my suspicions. I accordingly one day introduced the subject of apparatus, in conversation, spoke of prices, &c., and casually remarked that this microscope which he had bought for the College must be a very fine one (I had not then seen it) as it cost a large amount. I cannot, of course, give the language of that distant conversation, but the point I was after was brought out, viz: a statement from him, that the article did cost \$148. This conversation convinced me that your suspicions, and the rest of the Faculty, were groundless, and I took an early occasion to tell you so, and I cited the above conversation to prove that you were wrong, and Dr. Sanford right. But you, and some others of the Faculty still seemed to think that the microscope had been overcharged, and that I must be wrong myself.

Still confused, and anxious to settle it in my own mind, I soon afterwards made it in my way to ask Dr. Sanford directly the cost of the instrument. I was reluctant to do so, for I thought to myself that this second query, upon the same point, might be regarded by him, as insulting—a second time he assured me the price was \$148.—Feeling no further uneasiness upon the matter, or not enough to affect my conduct, I soon entered into a formal partnership with him,

After our partnership was confirmed, the rumors and suspicions alluded to, gathered more definite shape and substance, and were gradually confirmed. You remember that I took but little interest in these suspicions, but was in fact rather chagrined to meet with them. Not only was I not inclined to credit them, since the object of suspicion was my partner, but more than that, you will remember I often endeavored to defend Dr. Sanford, and to such an extent too, that I found my efforts at protecting him were placing me in a relation towards the rest of the Faculty altogether too equivocal for my enjoyment.

I cannot at this distant day, remember dates distinctly. But it was some little time after my partnership with Dr. Sanford, that a letter was sent by some one of the Faculty—I was not sufficiently in your confidence at the time to be informed who was the author—to the manufacturer of the microscope, for the purpose of ascertaining the actual cost of the instrument. To our utter astonishment an answer was received from Benj. Pike, Jr., giving a duplicate of the bill of sale by which Dr. Sanford purchased, rating the microscope at \$48.

Of course my next step was a dissolution of the existing partnership between us.—When I explicitly stated to him that I wished to put an end to any further association with him, it was plainly necessary that I should give my reasons. In the course of the

conversation, I brought up the microscope, recounted his two former statements to me that it cost \$148, and then contrasted with these statements the recent disclosures from New York City, of which you had informed him. His reply, the obvious and to me very painful imputation of falsehood was I think in about these words, certainly to this effect:—"Well, I could not help it—there was no other way—fact was, I had to— you see, I had said so before, to other persons, and I had to stick to it—it is the first time I ever did do such a thing." I think he added a sort of personal apology for having deceived me, and been the means of betraying my confidence.

(Signed) J. E. SANBORN.

STATE OF IOWA, }
Lee County, } ss.

I, the undersigned, hereby certify that J. E. Sanborn subscribed the within instrument before me, and being by me duly sworn on his solemn oath, says { SEAL } that the statements therein made are true to the best of his knowledge and belief.

(Signed) W. C. STRIPE,
Notary Public.

PAPER (C).

KEOKUK, IOWA, 18th April, 1855.

Prof. JOHN E. SANBORN:

Understanding that you are about to attend the National Medical Convention, soon to assemble in Philadelphia, and expect to visit the East with the design of seeing the operations of Medical Schools, we, your fellow citizens, embrace this opportunity of presenting you, unsolicited, a testimonial of our appreciation of your merits as a professional man, and private citizen. Permit us to commend you as a gentleman whom we have intimately known for several years, distinguished for your varied accomplishments and attainments in the great profession with which you have connected yourself, of exalted worth socially, of exemplary and unexceptionable private and professional integrity, a citizen endeared to us all, by the most pleasant intercourse.

Hoping that you may realize the expectations of your tour, and return speedily, we remain

Most respectfully, Your fellow citizens.

D. W. KILBOURNE,	C. T. McCUNE,	JOHN BURNS,
Mayor of City	JAMES E. BURKE,	J. L. CURTIS,
JOHN A. GRAYHAM,	WM. C. FUNKHOUSER,	E. H. HARRISON,
JAMES M. SHELLEY,	J. M. HUTCHINSON,	SAML. R. CURTIS,
CHARLES PARSONS,	ALBERT L. CONNABLE,	WM. LEIGHTON,
G. B. REED,	JOHN W. CLEGHORN,	THOS. W. CLAGETT,
WM. W. BELKNAP,	H. T. REID,	JAS. L. ESTES,
W. C. RENTGEN,	JOHN McCUNE,	JAMES G. SHIELDS,
GEORGE RUSSELL,	GEO. C. DIXON,	P. W. POTTER,
GUY WELLS,	JAS. F. COX,	D. W. PESSEL,
V. P. VAN ANTWERP,	H. STAFFORD,	T. H. ALLYN,
A. BRIDGMAN,	J. C. ESTES,	J. W. OGDEN,
A. B. CHITTENDEN,	JOHN P. EVANS,	JOHN W. RANKIN.
C. F. CONN,		

EXTRACT FROM PROF. MCGUGIN'S TESTIMONY.

PAPER (D).

In the fall of 1851, Dr. Sanford went to New York by direction of the Faculty, for the purpose of purchasing appliances for the College, and some time during the session of 1851-52, towards the close of it I think, the Faculty met in the College Hall with the view to a settlement with Dr. Sanford, and to hear a report of his proceedings while at New York. In that settlement he presented bills and papers embracing the articles purchased in New York, and their prices. I was President of the Faculty, and the

papers were handed to me, and I reported the contents to the Faculty for action.— Among other papers was a bill rendered by Benj. Pike, Jr., of New York, for a microscope, representing the price to be \$148, which bill was receipted; and the voucher of C. E. Isaacs, of New York, stating that Dr. Sanford had paid him \$125, for Pathological specimens. This was in the form of an ordinary receipt, and was presented by Dr. Sanford, to which the name of C. E. Isaacs was attached. These vouchers were retained by Dr. Sanford, and never restored to the College.

Dr. Sanford resigned in consequence of the course he had pursued with the funds of the College. The choice of resignation was extended to him, because the Faculty did not desire to expel him.

(Signed)

D. L. MCGUGIN.

SUBSTANCE OF DR. HUGHES TESTIMONY.

PAPER (E).

Dr. Sanford visited New York in the fall of 1851, for the purchase of appliances for the Medical College. He purchased of Benj. Pike, Jr., a microscope for \$48, and represented to the Faculty the price paid, \$148, and presented a voucher to that effect.— Also, the bill of C. E. Isaacs, of \$25, he represented to have paid \$125. Late in January, I notified him that his misrepresentation of Benj. Pike's bill had been discovered, he acknowledged the fact, and said it was the first black spot in the history of his life, and asked me for GOD SAKE to say nothing about it. I requested him to resign, as the Faculty would be compelled to take action in the case if he did not. At our next meeting his resignation was presented by Prof. Sanborn, and accepted.

(Signed)

J. C. HUGHES.

C. E. ISAACS SWORN.

PAPER (F).

INTERROGATORY—Did John F. Sanford make a bill with you in the fall of 1851, for Pathological Specimens for the Medical College at Keokuk, Iowa? if so, attach the bill as an Exhibit—how much money did the bill call for? and how much money did defendant, Sanford, pay you?

ANSWER—In the fall of 1851, he gave me twenty-five dollars for Pathological Specimens to be furnished to the Medical College of Keokuk, Iowa. I sent on some of the Specimens at the time, the remainder some months afterwards. I do not remember whether any bill was made, or any receipt given. This is the only transaction with the defendant Sanford, in which he ever paid me any money.

(Signed)

C. E. ISAACS.

MONTGOMERY GIBBS, Commissioner.

DR. KIRTLEY RYLANDS CERTIFICATE.

PAPER (G).

I certify that in May, 1854, I came to the City of Keokuk with a view of practicing medicine. Before settling here, I became acquainted with Dr. Jno. F. Sanford, and he used every means to prejudice me against Dr. J. C. Hughes, saying that he was a quack, scoundrel, &c. and that the community had no confidence in him, and would not employ him if they could do any better.

I also certify, that on one occasion, Dr. Sanford, in reply to a remark of mine, said, "Yes, and Dr. Hughes knows, God damn him, that if it had not been for the persuasion of my friends, he would not now be alive," or "I would not have left him alive," or words to that effect.

(Signed)

KIRTLEY RYLAND, M. D.